

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., FEBRUARY 21, 1923.

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1923 was held in its office at 1729 New York Avenue, Northwest, Washington, D. C., Wednesday, February 21, 1923.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Fraser,
Mr. Ayres,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Medary,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and

Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETING: The minutes of the meeting held December 18 and 19, 1922, were approved.
2. MONROE DOCTRINE CENTENNIAL COIN: Mr. Fraser submitted photographs of the model of the obverse and the reverse for the Monroe Doctrine Centennial Coin, which is being completed by Mr. Chester Beach, sculptor, of New York. On the obverse appears the heads of President Monroe and of his Secretary of State John Quincy Adams, and on the reverse allegorical figures of North and South America; also the usual legends required on memorial coins.

The Commission thought the design well executed and approved the same, with the suggestion that instead of having a curve at the base of the portraits, the sculptor make the line straight. Mr. Fraser stated that the sculptor would submit the completed model, or photographs thereof, to the Commission for transmission to the Director of the Mint.

3. MARINE STATUE, PARIS ISLAND, SOUTH CAROLINA. Mr. Fraser reported that he had inspected the full size model of the statue of the Marine for Paris Island, South Carolina, in the studio of Robert Aitken, sculptor, of

New York City, and found it very good; also the model of the pedestal for the statue, which was satisfactory.

Upon the recommendation of Mr. Fraser, the Commission approved the full size model of the statue, and the model of the pedestal. (Exhibit A).

4. WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY, CHAPEL: Dr. Henry Louis Smith, President of Washington and Lee University, at Lexington, Virginia, appeared before the Commission and said he desired the advice of the Commission with reference to a plan for the enlargement of the University Chapel, where rest the remains of General Robert E. Lee, President of the University from 1865 to 1870, but without disturbing the "shrine" in the old chapel, in view of strong opposition to any such change.

President Smith said he and the Board of Trustees of the University have given the matter a great deal of thought, but that they are undecided as to the feasibility of the architectural problem involved in the enlargement of the chapel. The project he said has the endorsement of the Daughters of the Confederacy, through Resolutions adopted at several Conventions. There are some who desire a distinctly separate auditorium for student activities of the University. However, President Smith said the plan he has to submit to the Commission is to join to the old chapel the proposed new chapel, which would serve the purposes of an auditorium for the public exercises of the University, and that the new chapel would be within a few hundred feet of the Lee Highway, which is being completed. The tomb of General Lee, he said, is being visited now by from 200 to 500 persons a month, who come over bad roads, and that when the Lee Highway is completed this number would be increased to from 5,000 to 10,000 persons a month.

President Smith submitted sketches of the proposed plan, made by

Mr. B. C. Flournoy, architect of Washington, who was present, which the Commission considered. It was noted that there is a 17 foot fall between the old chapel and the front of the proposed new chapel and that in order not to disturb the tomb of General Lee it would be necessary to make a drop in the floor of about 8 feet and build the new chapel accordingly, to coordinate it to the old chapel. Mr. Medary said that the plan proposed for building the new chapel, as presented by President Smith, is a perfectly logical expression of an unusual situation; and that if the University has adhered to the colonial type of building they would be justified in building the new chapel of that type.

The Commission were of the opinion that the plan of the University for the new chapel could be carried out in a satisfactory manner, and in response to the invitation of President Smith said they hoped it possible to visit the University in the near future for an inspection of the grounds (Exhibit B).

5. FIRST DIVISION MEMORIAL: Mr. Earl G. Marsh, Superintendent of Parks, appeared before the Commission in behalf of Colonel C. O. Sherrill, regarding the treatment of the grounds for the First Division Memorial. Mr. Marsh made the following statement:

"Colonel Sherrill has asked that I represent him in bringing before the Commission his views with respect to the landscape treatment about the First Division Memorial.

Under date of January 29th Colonel Sherrill addressed a letter to Mr. Gilbert, Architect of the First Division Memorial, requesting that he appear before this meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts with complete plans as to the landscape treatment of the area surrounding the proposed memorial. Also, under date of February 3d, Mr. Gilbert was advised that no roadway should be provided south of the Memorial.

Colonel Sherrill feels that the plan showing the proposed present treatment of the grounds prepared by Mr. Gilbert and accompanied by a memorandum from Mr. Moore, presents but a temporary solution of the problem and does not comply with his request for complete plans. No positive assurance has been given that funds are available for completing without expense to the United States a suitable setting for the Memorial. If I understand Colonel Sherrill correctly, he is of the opinion that the proposed present treatment as outlined in Mr. Moore's memorandum is inadequate to the Memorial and will result in an unfinished

appearance, likely to be perpetuated for a considerable period with the possibility of it becoming necessary to complete the setting at the expense of the United States.

In view of the above, Colonel Sherrill is unwilling that the construction of the Memorial shall proceed until plans shall have been submitted and approved and positive assurance given of sufficiency of funds to complete the landscape treatment in every detail."

Mr. Marsh said that stakes have been driven into the ground, which according to the plan submitted by Mr. Gilbert, indicate that on the south side the base of the monument will be from 4 to 5 feet higher than the present ground level; and that therefore Colonel Sherrill feels it very important that some definite landscape plan must be agreed upon, to give the monument a good setting with respect to the adjoining area, and that this must be done without expense to the Government, the Act providing that the monument shall be erected without expense to the United States.

Mr. Moore stated that in January he appointed Mr. Ayres and Mr. Bacon as a committee to consult with Mr. Gilbert regarding the ground treatment of the monument and that the conclusions reached (and to which Mr. Marsh referred) were submitted to Colonel Sherrill in a letter dated February 16, 1923, as follows:

"The Commission of Fine Arts, having given further consideration to the design and location plan of the First Division Memorial, transmit herewith blueprints thereof, with the following recommendations:

1. Plan Showing Proposed Present Treatment of Grounds Immediately Surrounding the Monument.

The Monument to be erected 115 feet south of the north curb of the roadway south of the State, War and Navy Building.

As indicated on the drawing, there should be a simple platform paving with broad granite borders, surrounding the Monument, and outside of this will be a terrace fitting the grades of the sodded ground. This plan is approved by the Commission.

2. Plan Showing Possible Future Development of Grounds Surrounding the Monument.

The paving shown in the proposed present treatment forms a part of the future development. The Plan of the future development suggests the "Island" treatment, if and when traffic conditions require a roadway

south of the Monument. The Commission advise that until the First Division Monument is erected, no landscape treatment be undertaken other than that shown in design No.1, entitled "Proposed Present Treatment of Grounds".

Mr. Ayres stated that, as he understood it, the First Division has not sufficient funds to make the development around the Memorial and that the Commission originally suggested the monument be in the center of a central plaza to be developed at a future date; that the First Division did not propose to develop all that part of the vista south of the State, War and Navy building; and that he and Mr. Bacon with Mr. Gilbert agreed upon the design which has been submitted providing for the Proposed Present Treatment of Grounds immediately surrounding the monument and plan showing Possible Future Development.

The Commission approved the recommendations of the Committee as set forth in the letter of February 16th to Colonel Sherrill and thought that at this time it would be impossible to say what final form the treatment of the area south of the First Division Monument to B Street should take. However, the Commission felt that the First Division Monument upon its erection should be given such landscape treatment as not to give the monument an unfinished appearance, and that the First Division should give assurance that this would be done without expense to the Government. The conclusions of the Commission in the matter were submitted to Colonel Sherrill. (Exhibit C). (also C-1 & C-2).

6. WASHINGTON LOAN AND TRUST BUILDING. The Washington Loan and Trust Company submitted sketches through their architect, Mr. Arthur B. Heaton, for a proposed new building at 17th and G Street, N.W. The sketches were inspected by Mr. Ayres, and his recommendations approved (Exhibit D).

7. NEW LAMP POSTS FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA. The District Commissioners through Mr. A. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, and Captain John E. Wood,

Assistant to the District Engineer Commissioner, submitted sketches for a new lamp post for the District of Columbia, to improve the lighting of the city, as follows:

- Design A, 20 feet high, recommended for immediate use;
- Design B, the same as A, excepting with different shaped globe, and the height to be 17 feet;
- Design C, suggesting a lamp post with a goose-neck;
- Design D, suggesting a lamp-post with a right-angle arm;

Designs A, B, C, or D, would be used for Avenues or Streets.

Design E, suggested for circles, reservations, and plazas, as the Union Station Plaza, and possibly also for Pennsylvania Avenue, in view of the width of the Avenue.

The Commission, after careful consideration, advised that the Millet lamp-post, especially as to proportions, should be adhered to. In none of the designs submitted did the Commission consider the proportions satisfactory. The design of the lamp-post about the Pennsylvania Station in New York and those designed to go around the Lincoln Memorial show a base not exceeding $6\frac{1}{2}$ inches in diameter, and it is believed that this is sufficient for an 18 foot pole.

Mr. Harris submitted for inspection a globe, which is to have in it a reflector. Mr. Medary said the globe is of the ordinary stock type. The Commission advised that the globe should be redesigned and a model of the entire lamp post made. Mr. Harris said this would be done in time for the next meeting of the Commission.

8. PROPOSED PLAN FOR D. C. PENAL RESERVATION, at LORTON, VIRGINIA: The District Commissioners, through Mr. Harris and Captain Wood, submitted a sketch design for a proposed plan for the treatment of the grounds of the D. C. Penal Institution,--commonly known as "Occoquan". The plan consists of three major group of buildings--the Reformatory, the Workhouse, and the Female Department.

the first of these is the fact that the
the second is the fact that the

the third is the fact that the
the fourth is the fact that the

the fifth is the fact that the
the sixth is the fact that the

the seventh is the fact that the
the eighth is the fact that the

the ninth is the fact that the
the tenth is the fact that the

the eleventh is the fact that the
the twelfth is the fact that the

the thirteenth is the fact that the
the fourteenth is the fact that the

the fifteenth is the fact that the
the sixteenth is the fact that the

the seventeenth is the fact that the
the eighteenth is the fact that the

The design also indicated suggested locations for an administration building in a commanding position; a hospital and physicians' quarters, somewhat isolated; residences for the families of officials, bordering a parkway; home sites for guards, situated between the Railroad Station and the main entrance gate, grouped to form a small village, with post office, store, school and church; there are to be some houses for guards in outpost positions bounding the reservation.

As industrial units, in addition to the present brick yard, the plan suggested an agricultural group, a vineyard, and a commercial managed forest,-- fruit orchards being now on the place.

The Commission took the plan under advisement, and decided to make a trip of inspection of the grounds, possibly at the next meeting.

9. THE JOHN BURROUGHS SCHOOL: The District Commissioners, through Mr. Harris, submitted a plan of the John Burroughs School at Brookland, contemplating the development of the grounds to provide an open air theatre, athletic field, girls playground, children's gardens, and neighborhood park. The plan was approved by the Commission.

10. POLICE STATION NO.12. The District Commissioners, through Mr. Harris, submitted a design for a new Police Station, No.12, to be erected at Rhode Island Avenue and Seventeenth Street, N.E. The Commission thought the design good and it was approved.

11. PROPOSED WATER FRONT TREATMENT, WASHINGTON CHANNEL: The District Commissioners, through Captain John E. Wood, Assistant to the District Engineer Commissioner, submitted a suggested treatment of a design, which the Commission approved, for the proposed Water Front Treatment from Maryland Avenue, S. W., to the War College, to provide for a commercial quay and pleasure boulevard along the Washington Channel, connecting East Potomac Park

with the War College and the Anacostia Development project. The quay will have space for commercial piers, warehouses, steamboat offices, boat houses, and commercial houses, of which the Municipal Fish Market now in the locality is a type. The quay will be similar to those at Budapest.

The Commission recognized in the design a very desirable and needed improvement for Washington, and emphasized its importance as a connecting link between East Potomac Park and the Anacostia Park now under development along the east side of the District of Columbia. A special report is to be submitted to the District Commissioners.

12. **STATUE OF SERENITY:** The Commission considered tentatively the question of site for the Statue of Serenity, which is being given to Washington by Mr. Charles Deering, of Chicago, and for which legislation is pending. The statue is by José Clard, a noted sculptor of Europe, and is a copy of the original, which is at the Luxembourg. Mr. Moore thought a suitable location for the statue would be Meridian Hill Park, in which Mr. Fraser concurred. Mr. Medary suggested the Mall.

13. **STATUE OF GENERAL SAN MARTIN:** Under date of January 19, 1923, the Secretary of State addressed a letter to the Commission advising that--

"The people of the Argentine Republic, in reciprocation of the action of American citizens in presenting the city of Buenos Aires with a statue of George Washington, desire to present to the United States for erection in the city of Washington, opposite the Pan American Union Building or at some other convenient site within the executive grounds, an equestrian statue of General San Martin, and that the statue is now ready and in condition to be shipped as soon as the sanction of Congress for its erection shall have been obtained.

"Recognizing in this action the friendly good will entertained by the people of Argentina for the people of the United States, I shall be thankful if the Commission will find it convenient to give the matter its prompt attention and will advise me of its action."

Under date of February 3, 1923, the Third Assistant Secretary of State submitted in behalf of the Argentine Embassy a blueprint of the pedestal.

The Commission considered the plan of the pedestal for the statue, and discussed the question as to whether the pedestal suggested in the plan would harmonize with the statue. It was noted, from a photograph of the original statue in Buenos Aires, that the pedestal of that statue had certain elements which better comport with the equestrian group than will the pedestal proposed. The Commission also requested information as to the material to be used--such information being necessary to a determination of the site. (Exhibit E)

14. DOMINICAN CAMPAIGN MEDAL: Under date of January 31, 1923, the Secretary of the Navy submitted the following letter to the Commission, again asking advice as to securing a suitable design for the Dominican Campaign Medal:

"The Department has had considerable correspondence with the Fine Arts Commission on the subject of a design for the Dominican Campaign Medal,--so far without definite result. In the meantime the fact that a medal has been awarded to commemorate participation in the Dominican Campaign is known throughout the Service and the Department is embarrassed by its inability to supply the medal.

Several designs submitted by the Department to the Fine Arts Commission did not meet with its approval and it was suggested that the preparation of the design and model be placed in the hands of a competent medalist to be selected by the Commission, and for which the artist should be paid \$1,000. The Commission was advised that the Department's appropriations did not permit of an allotment of this amount.

In the Dominican Campaign only a comparatively small number of officers and men participated and the amount suggested as payment to the medalist creating the design, while probably modest for the services of an artist, would almost equal the entire cost of striking off and completing the medals. Furthermore, if the Commission insists that this expense is necessary for a medal of such minor importance as the Dominican Campaign Medal, it is fair to presume that in the future estimates for new medals, etc., must in all cases include the increased expense of the service of the artist producing the design.

With these facts in mind and weighing, not only the aesthetic demands of art but the material need for economy so emphasized and necessary today in Governmental expenditures, I beg to request, Mr. Chairman, that you please submit a plan whereby the Navy Department may secure at an early date a Dominican Campaign Medal satisfactory to the Fine Arts Commission without incurring an initial expense for the artist out of proportion to the significance of the medal and establishing a precedent which will mean increased cost to the Government for all medals to be issued in the future."

The matter was submitted to Mr. Fraser, and the Commission endorsed his recommendation that the standard set by the Commission of Fine Arts for

the production of a good medal should be adhered to (Exhibit F).

15. AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE: Suresnes,--The War Department, through Colonel H. R. Casey, Chief of the Engineering Division, Bureau of Construction, and Mr. G. G. Will, his Chief Draftsman, submitted sketches for buildings, gateways and fences, including a general plan for the layout of the permanent American Cemetery at Suresnes. The Commission inspected the plans and recommended simplification of the designs and that they be resubmitted to the Commission at the next meeting.

16. ARCHITECTS' ADVISORY COUNCIL: Mr. Moore reported that under date of January 12th he received a letter from Mr. Horace W. Peaslee, Chairman of the Architects' Advisory Council, advising that--

"One phase of the activities of the Architects' Advisory Council is an honorary award for the best building constructed during 1923 in each of several classes. To meet objections about American Institute of Architects Chapter supervision or of personal equation, I have suggested that, after a preliminary grouping and weeding, the final selection should rest with the Fine Arts Commission. As an incidental feature, I believe that such contact with private building might gain more popular support for the Commission in various other matters. May we have your cooperation in this project?"

Mr. Moore stated he referred the matter to the Architect members of the Commission, whose report, in substance, he forwarded to Mr. Peaslee, on January 30th, as follows:

"Apparently the purpose of the Council is the same as that of a similar body which has acted in New York for a number of years, and they are inclined to think that the award of a prize should represent the judgment of the Council rather than of the Commission of Fine Arts. Their reason for this belief is a conviction that if the award is to have any value in Washington it should be recognized as the expression of the practicing architects of this city,--at least this is the chief value of the award that has been made in New York City."

To this letter, Mr. Moore stated, Mr. Peaslee replied on February 1st:--

"After writing you it was found that a committee of the Board

of Trade, which had been working along the same line for three years, was about to launch a similar program. It had been their idea to bring in a Baltimore architect as advisor so that local prejudices or preferences would not be factors in making the award.

In order to avoid conflict, the Council has withdrawn from this movement but the suggestion has been made, and well received, that the architects of the Fine Arts Commission give the final award after the preliminary work has been done. I really believe that this collaboration would be extremely valuable in calling attention to the fact that private building is regarded by the Commission as a factor for good or evil in the appearance of the city.

Mr. Moore said he advised Mr. Peaslee that he would consult the architect members of the Commission further in the matter at this meeting.

Mr. Bacon having reported heretofore that he was not in favor of having the Commission of Fine Arts make the honorary award, as suggested by Mr. Peaslee, as it would impose additional duties to the present extensive work of the Commission, Mr. Ayres and Mr. Medary reaffirmed their views, similarly, as set forth in the report to Mr. Peaslee dated January 30th. Mr. Peaslee was advised accordingly (Exhibit G).

17. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE: Colonel Sherrill being prevented from attending the meeting, because of official duties, matters pertaining to the Arlington Memorial Bridge were postponed until the next meeting.

The Commission adjourned at 5:00 p.m. During the day the Commission made a trip of inspection with Senator George W. Pepper, of Pennsylvania, through the Mall and to the Meade Memorial site, during which the Commission explained to Senator Pepper the plan to develop the botanic garden area, in which the Grant and the Meade Memorials are located, into Union Square, at the head of the Mall, according to the Plan of 1901. Efforts made during the closing days of the 67th Congress to secure an appropriation of \$117,635, in the Third Deficiency Bill, to repair and reconstruct the "Greenhouse" in the area, at its present site, resulted in a disagreement and in the omission of the item from the Bill. The Commission also made a trip of inspection to the Lincoln Memorial, to consider the problem of approach for the Arlington Memorial Bridge, and along the proposed Rock Creek and Potomac Parkway.

C O P Y

12

February 23, 1923.

Dear General Lejeune:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 21st, approved the full size model of the Statue of a Marine, by Robert Aitken, sculptor, to be erected at Paris Island, South Carolina. The Commission also approved the model of the pedestal for this statue, with suggestions made to the sculptor.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major General John A. Lejeune,

Commandant,

United States Marine Corps.

EXHIBIT A.

February 23, 1923.

Dear Dr. Smith:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 21st, heard with interest your statement as to the plan of the University to enlarge the chapel for Washington and Lee University, at which time you asked the Commission to consider the feasibility architecturally of enlarging the chapel to coordinate it with the existing chapel, where rest the remains of General Robert E. Lee.

The Commission were of the opinion that the plan of the University for the new chapel could be carried out in a satisfactory manner. The Commission hope to be able to visit the University in the near future and make an inspection of the grounds, as you desire.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Dr. Henry Louis Smith, President,
Washington and Lee University,
Lexington, Virginia.

EXHIBIT B.

February 21, 1923.

Dear Colonel Sherrill:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting today heard Mr. Earl G. Marsh, Superintendent of Parks, in your behalf, with regard to the location plan of the First Division Monument.

It is evident that some misunderstandings have arisen. The First Division originally asked to have a site on the axis of E Street, N. W. The Commission thought the monument should go at the north end of the vista and be related to the State, War and Navy Building. Then the question of traffic arose, and the Commission asked to have studies made showing how, in the event that an additional road should be deemed necessary, it could be put in without disturbing the monument, and also what the landscape treatment might be in the immediate vicinity of the monument. The Commission having satisfied themselves on these points recommended that the monument be located in accordance with what they understood to be the point agreed upon by the Officer in Charge of Public Buildings and Grounds and the Architect of the Monument.

It is understood by this Commission that when the monument is erected there will be a hedge about the pavement, which will relate the monument to the landscape, so that the monument will receive a good setting, and that this hedge will be furnished by the First Division.

The Commission deprecate any further changes in this area until a plan can be worked out for the treatment of the entire space south to B Street. Until such a plan has been prepared the less done in this area the easier will become the treatment of the entire region. The Commission therefore recommend that permission be given the Architect of the First Division Monument to begin work in accordance with the plan showing Proposed Present Treatment of Grounds. The Commission understand that this involves no expense to the United States in connection with the First Division Memorial.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Colonel C. O. Sherrill,

Officer in Charge,

Office of Public Buildings and Grounds.

EXHIBIT C.

OFFICE OF
PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

February 24, 1923.

Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts,
1729 New York Avenue, N.W.,
Washington, D. C.

My dear Mr. Moore:

Receipt is acknowledged of your letter of February 21st, concerning the First Division Memorial.

The above mentioned letter does not to my mind make clear whether the setting proposed to be executed at this time by the First Division Memorial Association is to be considered as a complete and appropriate setting for a memorial in the site on which this monument is to be placed.

As I pointed out in my letter of February 3d to Mr. Cass Gilbert, it is desired that the First Division Memorial Association shall so install the monument that it will completely harmonize with its surroundings without any necessity for future study for its completion and without any necessity for future expense on the part of the United States to carry out this purpose.

Your attention is called to the fact that the present design of the park area south of the State, War and Navy Department building is in accordance with plans which have been officially acted upon and advised by the Commission of Fine Arts, and consequently your remark that "The Commission deprecate any further changes in this area until a plan can be worked out for the treatment of the entire space south to B Street" is not understood.

In reference to the setting of the monument shown on plan marked No.1, it appears to me that this will not be a satisfactory treatment, but rather an improvised setting that will be a constant eyesore until such time as the entire area in that vicinity is redesigned and regraded to harmonize with the setting of the memorial. In this I may be wrong, but if so I would be very glad to be corrected by a definite statement from you to the effect that the Commission of Fine Arts is satisfied that **it** will give an entirely satisfactory treatment for this memorial without any expectation whatever of any prospective or ultimate change of design of the surrounding park area.

Your attention is called to the fact that there is nothing shown on design No.1 to indicate the hedge surrounding the memorial mentioned in paragraph 3 of your letter.

This office is extremely anxious to have this matter of the correct setting of the First Division Monument decided upon at once, in order that work may be commenced and it is, therefore, requested that your reply to this letter be expedited.

Yours very respectfully,

C. O. Sherrill

February 28, 1923.

Dear Colonel Sherrill:

Referring to your letter of February 24: the plan of August 2, 1916, submitted by the Office of Public Buildings and Grounds (P. B. & G. 1-1-1.25), and approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, was primarily a planting plan for the development of the west portion of the President's park. That planting plan has been carried out in part, but the paths have not been put in as shown on the plan; nor has the shrubbery been arranged in accordance with the plan. The Commission are aware of this, and therefore the statement in my letter to you of February 21st, that "The Commission deprecate any further change in this area until a plan can be worked out for the treatment of the entire space south to B Street". In the Plan of 1901 this area is shown as a series of shaded walks leading from the city thoroughfares to the recreation grounds of Potomac Park. The plan of August 2, 1916, is a step in this direction.

The action of Congress and the Joint Committee on the Library in locating the First Division Memorial south of the State, War and Navy building does not in any way interfere with the plan of August 2, 1916, save that it may require the transplanting of a few small trees at the north end of the vista--I should say, after inspecting the site, not more than four.

It is understood by the Commission of Fine Arts that the First Division will adapt its memorial to the ground in such manner as to leave a finished and completed structure, without disturbance or unsightliness. In this connection, Mr. Cass Gilbert, Architect of the First Division Memorial, has advised me that--

"It is the purpose of the First Division Memorial Association, and my own, to leave the grounds surrounding the Monument in a finished appearance without expense to the United States and to place the hedge about the Monument as shown by the design entitled "Proposed Present Treatment of Grounds."

I have noticed that the plan, Proposed Present Treatment of Grounds, does not indicate the hedge. The plan could be amended to show the hedge, but in view of Mr. Gilbert's positive statement, above quoted, this would not seem necessary.

The First Division Memorial, erected according to the design submitted, including the ground treatment, will thus not be an eyesore, but a complete monument, adapted to the location.

Your office being desirous of having the work of erecting the Memorial begun, I trust that this additional information will suffice. I am returning the designs herewith.

Sincerely yours,

Colonel C. O. Sherrill,
Officer in Charge,
Office of Public Buildings and Grounds.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

C O P Y

February 23, 1923.

Dear Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on February 21st were pleased to have the opportunity to see the sketches of Mr. Arthur B. Heaton, Architect, for your proposed new building at 17th and G Streets, N. W., opposite the State, War and Navy building, as it will bear such a prominent relation to a public building and to that part of Pennsylvania Avenue.

The Commission strongly advise that you do not use the corner entrance, as they are convinced the central entrance will not only give you a more monumental and satisfactory architectural result, but a much better banking room plan.

Since the building will be seen from a considerable distance along Pennsylvania Avenue, the Commission feel that a cupola of any kind on the roof would be unfortunate and it would seem unnecessary for fighting with the high windows on two sides. The Commission think that the type adopted by Mr. Heaton in his sketches is fine and suitable both for your purpose and the locality.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Washington Loan and Trust Co.,

Washington, D. C.

EXHIBIT D.

C O P Y

February 28, 1923.

Sir:

In further reference to your letter of January 19th, (SYS 811.413 Sa 5/), I have to inform you that the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on February 21st, considered the plan of the pedestal for the equestrian statue of General San Martin, which statue has been given to the United States by the Republic of Argentina, and question whether the resulting pedestal will prove satisfactory. The pedestal of the original statue had certain elements which better comport with the equestrian group than will the pedestal proposed. The Commission also desire information as to the material to be used--if granite, the color and the quarry (if American); if American marble, the quarry from which the stone is to be taken. This information is necessary to a determination of the site.

Very respectfully, yours,

Chairles Moore,

Chairman.

The Honorable

The Secretary of State.

EXHIBIT C

February 26, 1923.

My dear Mr. Secretary:

Your letter of January 21st in regard to the Dominican Campaign Medal was submitted to Mr. Fraser, the sculptor member of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the matter came up for discussion at the meeting of the Commission on February 21st.

It is the judgment of the Commission that the United States should bestow no medal that is not satisfactory in design and execution. After prolonged discussion the Navy Medals--the Distinguished Service Medal, and the Distinguished Service Cross (with a ship in the center)--were designed without expense to the Department as a matter of patriotism on the part of the sculptor at the time when we were engaged in the World War. These are the only satisfactory medals which are now bestowed by the Navy Department. In the case of the Dominican Medal, the Commission believe that either the medal should be properly designed or should not be bestowed at all. The actual work of the sculptor in developing one of these medals requires a large amount of time and a great amount of skill. The French Government, which is by no means lavish, pays \$2500 for designing a medal. The sum of \$1500, which the Commission of Fine Arts has decided upon as a minimum for the sculptor's work, would cover only the actual expenses of such service. The Commission therefore recommend that this sum be set aside for the production of the design and \$300 for the dies. If this amount cannot be made available, it is recommended that a certificate be given in place of the medal.

Very respectfully,

The Honorable

Charles Moore,

The Secretary of the Navy.

Chairman.

February 26, 1923.

Dear Mr. Peaslee:

In further reference to your letter of February 1st, I have to inform you that at the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on February 21, 1923, the architect members of the Commission gave consideration to the suggestion indicated in your letter with reference to an Honorary Award, "that the architects of the Fine Arts Commission give the final award after the preliminary work has been done".

The architect members of the Commission desire me to inform you that they appreciate the courtesy extended in this matter, but they feel that the work of the Commission has grown to such proportions that they cannot take upon themselves the additional duties which would be required in serving on this "Jury of Award". At the same time they feel that, as expressed in the letter from the Commission to you on January 30th, "the award of a prize should represent the judgment of the Council (rather than of the Commission of Fine Arts), and that "if the award is to have any value in Washington it should be recognized as the expression of the practicing architects of this city."

Very respectfully, yours,

Mr. H. W. Peaslee, Chairman,
The Architects Advisory Council,
1504 H Street,
Washington, D. C.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

EXHIBIT G

1. The first part of the paper

2. The second part of the paper

3. The third part of the paper

4. The fourth part of the paper

5. The fifth part of the paper

6. The sixth part of the paper

7. The seventh part of the paper

8. The eighth part of the paper

9. The ninth part of the paper

10. The tenth part of the paper

11. The eleventh part of the paper

12. The twelfth part of the paper

13. The thirteenth part of the paper

14. The fourteenth part of the paper

15. The fifteenth part of the paper

16. The sixteenth part of the paper

17. The seventeenth part of the paper

18. The eighteenth part of the paper

19. The nineteenth part of the paper

20. The twentieth part of the paper

21. The twenty-first part of the paper

22. The twenty-second part of the paper

23. The twenty-third part of the paper

24. The twenty-fourth part of the paper

25. The twenty-fifth part of the paper